

Remarks

Claims 11–13 stand rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 11 has been amended to set forth a proper Markush recitation, and Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to replace “the treated area” with “a treated area”. Applicant submits that these amendments are sufficient to overcome the rejections under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and therefore respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1–20, 23 and 24 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3–15 of U.S. Patent 6,258,082 and Claims 1–13 of U.S. Patent 6,263,879. Applicant has submitted herewith an terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c), and therefore respectfully requests that the double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the same. If, however, some issue remains that the Examiner feels can be addressed by an Examiner’s Amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP

Dated: 4 June 04

By: Kyle F. Schlueter
Kyle F. Schlueter
Registration No. 54,912
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(310) 551-3450